at least one bearing on said shaft, said bearing adjacent one of said ends of said shaft, said bearing having a central bore sized to [balance] support said shaft during rotation, said central bore having an enlarged portion opening toward said one end of said shaft;

a retainer on said shaft for retaining said bearing on said shaft, said retainer positioned within said enlarged bore portion of said bearing;

a bearing at the other end of said shaft;

a power source electrically coupled with said motor;

an activation member electrically coupled with said motor and said power source for energizing and de-energizing said motor; and

an output coupled with said motor for driving a tool.

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Claims have been amended to overcome the objection. Reconsideration of the rejection is specifically requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Someya et al. (Someya) (U.S. 4,795,926). Someya et al. discloses a bearing 2 having a recess 23 within which is positioned a washer 12 and a bushing 13. The recess in Someya et al. opens away from the end of the shaft. The present invention in amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 define an enlarged bore which opens toward the end of the shaft onto which the bearing is positioned. This is opposite to what is disclosed in Someya et al. As stated in Someya et al., in Column 3, lines 1 and 2, "... adjusting washer 12 and a rotor bushing 13 fitted to the rotating shaft 5 which prevent axial shifting of the shaft." Therefore, it would not be practical to reverse the recess 23 in Someya et al. because doing so would eliminate the axial retention of the shaft. Thus, Applicant believes independent Claims 1, 8 and 15, as amended patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2, 6 and 7, which ultimately depend from Claim 1; Claims 9, 13 and 14, which ultimately depend from Claim 15, are believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is specifically requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dafler (U.S. 3,624,434) and Wrobel (U.S. 4,801,252). Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dafler (U.S. 3,624,434) and Wrobel (U.S. 4,801,252), in further view of Rosenthal, Jr. et al. (Rosenthal) (U.S. 3,829,722). As stated by the Examiner, Dafler teaches every aspect of the invention except the bearing having an enlarged portion for receiving the retainer and the [bearing] housing having a stepped configuration to receive the bearing. While Figure 4 of Wrobel may teach the stepped configuration of the bearing and the housing, Figure 4 of Wrobel does not teach a bearing with a central bore with the central bore having an enlarged portion opening toward the end of the

shaft as is now claimed in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Thus, Applicant believes independent Claims 1, 8 and 15, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-4, 6 and 7, which ultimately depend from Claim 1; Claims 9-11, 13 and 14, which ultimately depend from Claim 8; and Claims 16-18, 20 and 21, which ultimately depend from Claim 15, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is specifically requested.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant would submit that all Claims are in a condition for allowance and thus Applicant requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present amendment he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Michael J. Schmidt **f**€eg. No. 34,007

P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303 (248) 641-1600

Attorney Docket No. 0275D000247